



CITY HALL PARK IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

PAT Meeting

December 12, 2005, 3:00 – 4:30 PM

AGENDA WITH MEETING NOTES

Present

PAT: Peggy Dreisinger, Craig Montgomery, Bud Parker, Al Poole Staff: Cheryl Fraser, David Goldberg, Victoria Schoenburg

Summary of Last Meeting, *Cheryl Fraser*

Park Programming Questionnaire

David Goldberg discussed responses to date for the questionnaire. Most of the responses were from King County employees. The top issues were safety and cleanliness. They hope for a place where they can safely have lunch and engage in passive recreation (reading, sitting etc.) Most were skeptically hopeful that anything could be done to improve the park, and only through increased enforcement. A little less than 25% of the respondents wanted event or music of some sort. A smaller amount wanted some active recreational component.

Property Owners Meeting on Park and Area

David Goldberg discussed shared objectives of property owners for this park.

Schematic Options

Nakano and Ernst presented refinements in two options that outlined several courses of development. They outlined related programming and management responsibilities needed to develop the park based on various design options.

- Al Poole asked if a children's play area presented in option 1 could be gated. Parks and Nakano said yes it could be gated.
- Bud Parker thought the SE area near the KC building had a strong possibility as a retail area with café and tables. He did not like the relationship of the café plaza in option #2 and was concerned with noise and security in it. He preferred circulation in option #1 and felt both options had too much green and should not be open as an off leash area.

Public Comments

Citizen Kate Martin comments:

- Questioned why the access tunnel was needed for King County
- Requested that programming for nights and weekends be provided
- Suggested a "people" play area that would serve multiple ages, dogs, children, and adults
- Warned not to rely on courthouse for programming
- Thought back of building could provide programming like a library as in Bryant Park.

Next Steps

- No January meeting
- Review with Sr. Staff and Mayor - January 11 and 31
- Develop preferred schematic and phasing plan
- Landmarks/Design Commission Briefing – Early February
- Second public workshop – Mid February